

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
OMAR QAZI,  
Defendant.

Case No. 2:15-cr-14-APG-VCF

## **ORDER**

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (#62)  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (#63)  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (#64)

On September 14, 2015, Mr. Qazi filed three motions for reconsideration. (Docs. #62, #63, #64). Mr. Qazi's motions for reconsideration reiterate the same arguments that were previously presented to the court. This is inappropriate.

Generally, “[a] motion for reconsideration must set forth the following: (1) some valid reason why the court should revisit its prior order, and (2) facts or law of a ‘strongly convincing nature’ in support of reversing the prior decision.” *Henry*, 2010 WL 3636278, at \*1 (citing *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F.Supp.2d 1180, 1183 (D.Nev.2003)). Moreover, “[r]econsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.” *Id.* (citing *U.S. Aviation Underwriters v. Wesair, LLC*, No. 8-00891, 2010 WL 1462707 (D. Nev. April 12, 2010)) (internal citation and quotation marks omitted).

ACCORDINGLY, and for good cause shown,

IT IS ORDERED that Mr. Qazi's Motion for Reconsideration (#62) is DENIED.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Qazi's Motion for Reconsideration (#63) is DENIED.  
2

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Qazi's Motion for Reconsideration (#64) is DENIED.  
4

5 DATED this 15th day of September, 2015.  
6

7   
8

9  
10 CAM FERENBACH  
11  
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25